

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/028,267	RANGNEKAR ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kevin C. Harper	2666	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kevin C. Harper.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) William Bollman (Reg. No. 36,457).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 20 September 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 8.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner held that newly amended claim 8 contained new matter not originally disclosed in the specification (fig. 3, step 315 being the predetermined period of time of the method of claim 8 [specification, page 11, lines 16-19], whereas only a different method of fig. 2 having a different predetermined period of time in step 215 has support for a maximum round trip delay [specification, page 7, line 30 to page 8, line 4]). In order to advance prosecution, Applicant's representative agreed to cancel claim 8 so that the application may be allowed.